UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION III
1650 Arch Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103-2029

Ms. Ellen Gilinsky, Ph.D., Director
Division of Water Quality Programs
Virginia Department of Environmental Quality
629 Main Street
Richmond, VA 23219

Dear Ms. Gilinski:

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region III is pleased to approve the Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) for the primary contact use (bacteria) impairments on Carter and Great Run. The TMDL reports were submitted to EPA for review in January 2005. The TMDLs were established and submitted in accordance with Section 303(d)(1)(c) and (2) of the Clean Water Act to address impairments of water quality as identified in Virginia=s 1998 Section 303(d) list.

In accordance with Federal regulations at 40 CFR '130.7, a TMDL must comply with the following requirements: (1) designed to attain and maintain the applicable water quality standards, (2) include a total allowable loading and as appropriate, wasteload allocations (WLAs) for point sources and load allocations for nonpoint sources, (3) consider the impacts of background pollutant contributions, (4) take critical stream conditions into account (the conditions when water quality is most likely to be violated), (5) consider seasonal variations,
(6) include a margin of safety (which accounts for uncertainties in the relationship between pollutant loads and instream water quality), (7) consider reasonable assurance that the TMDL can be met, and (8) be subject to public participation. The enclosure to this letter describes how the TMDLs for the primary contact use impairments satisfy each of these requirements.

Following the approval of the TMDLs, Virginia shall incorporate the TMDLs into the appropriate Water Quality Management Plans pursuant to 40 CFR ' 130.7(d)(2). As you know, all new or revised National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permits must be consistent with the TMDL WLA pursuant to 40 CFR '122.44 (d)(1)(vii)(B). Please submit all such permits to EPA for review as per EPA=s letter dated October 1, 1998.

If you have any questions or comments concerning this letter, please don't hesitate to contact Mr. Thomas Henry at (215) 814-5752.

Sincerely,

Jon M. Capacasa, Director
Water Protection Division

Enclosure

Decision Rationale for the

Total Maximum Daily Loads for
the Primary Contact Use (Bacteriological) Impairments on
Great Run and Carter Run

I. Introduction

The Clean Water Act (CWA) requires a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) be developed for those water bodies identified as impaired by a state where technology-based and other controls will not provide for attainment of water quality standards. A TMDL is a determination of the amount of a pollutant from point, nonpoint, and natural background sources, including a margin of safety (MOS), that may be discharged to a water quality-limited water body.

This document will set forth the Environmental Protection Agency=s (EPA=s) rationale for approving the TMDLs for the primary contact use (bacteriological) impairments on the Carter and Great Run Watersheds. EPA=s rationale is based on the determination that the TMDLs meet the following eight regulatory conditions pursuant to 40 CFR '130.

1) The TMDLs are designed to implement applicable water quality standards.
2) The TMDLs include a total allowable load as well as individual waste load allocations (WLAs) and load allocations (LAs).
3) The TMDLs consider the impacts of background pollutant contributions.
4) The TMDLs consider critical environmental conditions.
5) The TMDLs consider seasonal environmental variations.
6) The TMDLs include a MOS.
7) There is reasonable assurance that the TMDLs can be met.
8) The TMDLs have been subject to public participation.

II. Background

The Carter and Great Run Watersheds are located in Fauquier County, Virginia. The watersheds are 35,600 and 18,000-acres in size respectively. The impaired segments for Carter and Great Run are 3.55 and 15.69 miles in length respectively. Forested lands make up the majority of the landuses within each watershed. Forested lands account for 63 percent of the watershed in Carter Run and 50 percent of the watershed in Great Run. Agricultural lands are the next largest landuse in the watersheds and make-up 35 percent of the lands in Carter Run and 46 percent of the lands in Great Run. Residential lands and open water make up the remaining lands in both watersheds.

In response to Section 303(d) of the CWA, the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (VADEQ) listed Carter and Great Run on Virginia=s 1998, 2002 and 2004 Section 303(d) lists as being unable to attain their primary contact use due to violations of the bacteriological criteria.

Table 1 - Impaired Stream Segments

Stream	Segment	List	Description
Carter Run	VAN-E02R	1998	Begins at its confluence with South Run and ends at its confluence with the Rappahannock River. (3.55 miles)
Great Run	VAP-F12R	1998	Begins at its headwaters Creek and ends at its confluence with the Rappahannock River. (15.69 miles)

Both of these waters were listed for violations of Virginia=s fecal coliform water quality criteria. Fecal coliform is a bacterium which can be found within the intestinal tract of all warm blooded animals. Fecal coliform in itself is not a pathogenic organism. However, fecal coliform indicates the presence of fecal wastes and the potential for the existence of other pathogenic bacteria. The higher concentrations of fecal coliform indicate the elevated likelihood of increased pathogenic organisms.

EPA encouraged the states to use e-coli and enterococci as the indicator species instead of fecal coliform. A better correlation was drawn between the concentrations of e-coli and enterococci, and the incidence of gastrointestinal illness. The Commonwealth adopted e-coli and enterococci criteria in January 2003. Streams are evaluated against the e-coli and enterococci criteria after 12 samples have been collected using these indicator species. Since 12 e-coli samples have been collected from both of these streams compliance is based upon the e-coli criteria.

As Virginia designates all of its waters for primary contact, all waters must meet the current bacteriological criteria for primary contact. Virginia=s criteria applies to all streams designated for primary contact for all flows. The e-coli criteria requires a geometric mean concentration of 126 colony forming units (cfu)/100ml of water with no sample exceeding 235 cfu/100ml of water. Although, the TMDLs and criteria require the e-coli concentration not to exceed 235 cfu/100 ml of water, waters are not placed on the Section 303(d) list if their violation rate does not exceed 10 percent.

The TMDLs submitted by Virginia are designed to determine the acceptable load of e-coli which can be delivered to the impaired waters, as demonstrated by the load-duration approach. The load-duration approach is considered an appropriate method to analyze the impaired waters through its analysis and comparison of observed flows, in-stream bacteria concentrations, and the numeric water quality criteria.

The load-duration approach analyzes the stream=s entire flow record to find a correlation between flow regimes and bacteriological concentrations. Since a flow gage was not located on either

of the impaired streams, simulated flows were developed for each of the waters. The TMDL modelers located flow gages on similar near by waters. Flow measurements were collected from Carter and Great Run during certain sampling events. A correlation analysis was run to compare the flows at the streams with gaging stations with the flows measured at the impaired segments. The United States Geological Survey (USGS) gage 01662800 on Battle Run and gage 01664000 on Rappahannock River were used to develop simulated flow records for Carter and Great Run respectively.

The flow data from the impaired segments were entered into Excel spreadsheets along with daily mean flow data from nearby, long term, continuous record gaging stations.[1] Using the Excel data analysis tools the impaired watersheds= flows were correlated to the observed data from the USGS gage. The gages on Battle Run and Rappahannock River were selected and used to predict the flow patterns for Carter and Great Run respectively, since their data produced the highest correlation with the impaired waters. The flow data from the impaired waters were plotted against the daily mean flow data from the USGS gages. Excel plotted a best fit line through the data and developed a regression equation for each of the impaired waters. Once the regression equations were developed, a simulated flow could be ascertained for the impaired waters based on the observed flows on Battle Run and Rappahannock River.

Through the use of the regression equation a flow record could be formed for each of the impaired waters. A flow record is essential to the load duration approach, as the flow determines the allowable loading (load that will allow the stream to attain criteria) and the observed loading. For each flow along the load-duration curve the allowable load can be determined by multiplying the numeric criteria (235 cfu/100ml) by the flow. The observed loads were determined by multiplying the observed concentrations by the simulated flow for that time. In order to insure that the TMDL was protective of all flow conditions, it was developed to the instance when the difference between the observed and allowable loadings was greatest. This process describes the first step in the development of the TMDL. The load duration approach was not developed for the geometric mean criteria as it is not a dynamic model that can predict the flow and load conditions associated with multiple monitoring events. However, the reductions were based on the largest exceedance of the instantaneous criteria and are to be applied to all flows. The reductions required to bring the largest violation into compliance are being applied to flows that are already in compliance and those which are not as severely impaired as well. Like all modeling efforts there is uncertainty in this model, but it is hoped that by modeling to the greatest observed violation the TMDL will attain all criteria.

The next step of the TMDL was to determine what organisms or sources are responsible for the

[1]VADEQ, March 2004, ABacteria TMDLs for Sepulcher Creek, Toms Creek, Little Toms Creek and Crab Orchard Branch

pollutant loading to the stream. Since e-coli, like fecal coliform, is associated with warm blooded animals as mentioned above, it was necessary to determine which animals were providing the bacteria loadings to the impaired waters. Through a process known as bacterial source tracking (BST), VADEQ was able to break down the source of bacteria into four categories. The four categories were human, pets, livestock, and wildlife. Three of these four sources are anthropogenic in origin and can be controlled via a variety of techniques. Wildlife, which may be attracted to certain areas due to anthropogenic modifications to the watershed is considered a natural source of bacteria.

The BST approach used by VADEQ is known as the Antibiotic Resistance Approach (ARA). ARA measures the bacteria=s resistance to a suite of antibiotics. The assumption is that bacteria associated with humans will have the highest resistance to antibiotics due to previous exposures to antibiotics. Livestock and pets would have the next highest resistance, while wildlife would exhibit the least resistance. In order to conduct this work, waste samples from known sources had to have their resistance measured, this information was placed into a library. The resistance of the bacteria collected in water samples was compared to the data in the library to determine its source. For additional information on the ARA please refer to Appendix B of the TMDL.

The data collected in steps one and two were then combined to determine the impact of the sources to water quality in the impaired waters. VADEQ collected one year of BST samples from the impaired waters, for each sample VADEQ determined the bacterial concentration and the percent loading derived from each source. The percent loading for each source category was averaged over the annual period and this average percent loading was used to determine the loading for each source.

In the Carter Run TMDL, the highest bacteria violation occurred during a flow of approximately 1,066 cubic feet per second (cfs). This is a very high flow in the watershed and based on the available data almost never exceeded. The e-coli load for this flow event was 3.63E+16 cfu/ year. The allowable load at this same flow was 2.24E+15 cfu/year. This represents a 94 percent reduction in loadings. Next the average annual flow was determined for Carter Run and the same magnitude violation was applied to that flow. Under these conditions the existing annual bacteria load was 1.98E+15 cfu/year. A 94 percent load reduction, percent reduction based on largest violation, was then applied to this e-coli load to yield an annual allowable load of 1.22E+14 cfu/year. The BST data demonstrated that livestock, pets, humans and wildlife represented 32, 21, 4 and 43 percent of the load respectively. Therefore, it was determined that all sources must be reduced.

In the Great Run TMDL, the highest bacteria violation occurred during a flow of approximately 100 cfs. Similar to the Carter Run TMDL, this is a very high flow for the watershed and based on the available data almost never exceeded. The e-coli load for this flow event was 3.43E+15 cfu/year. The allowable load at this same flow was 2.11E+14 cfu/year. This represents a 94 percent reduction in loadings. The average annual flow was determined for Great Run and the same magnitude violation was applied to that flow. Under these conditions, the existing annual bacteria load was 4.61E+14 cfu/year. A 94 percent load reduction, percent reduction based on largest violation, was then applied to this e-

coli load to yield an annual allowable load of 2.83E+13 cfu/year. The BST data demonstrated that livestock, pets, humans, and wildlife represented 32, 30, 4 and 33 percent of the load respectively. Therefore, it was determined that all sources must be reduced.

Through the development of this and other similar TMDLs, it was discovered that natural conditions (wildlife contributions to the streams) could cause or contribute to violations of the bacteria criteria. BST sampling data collected on the impaired streams indicated that bacteria from wildlife represents between 33 and 43 percent of the load. Many of Virginia=s TMDLs, including the TMDLs for Carter and Great Run, have called for some reduction in the amount of wildlife contributions to the affected streams. EPA believes that a reduction in wildlife is not practical and will not be necessary due to the implementation plan discussed below.

A phased implementation plan will be developed for all streams in which the TMDL calls for reductions in wildlife. In Phase 1 of the implementation, the Commonwealth will begin implementing the reductions (other than wildlife) called for in the TMDL. In Phase 2, which can occur concurrently to Phase 1, the Commonwealth will consider addressing its standards to accommodate this natural loading condition. The Commonwealth has indicated that during Phase 2, it may develop a Use Attainability Analysis (UAA) for streams with wildlife reductions which are not used for frequent bathing. Depending upon the result of the UAA, it is possible that these streams could be designated for secondary contact.

After the completion of Phase 1 of the implementation plan, the Commonwealth will monitor the streams to determine if the wildlife reductions are actually necessary, as the violation level associated with the wildlife loading may be smaller than the percent error of the model. In Phase 3, the Commonwealth will investigate the sampling data to determine if further load reductions are needed in order for these waters to attain standards. If the load reductions and/or the new application of standards allow the stream to attain standards, then no additional work is warranted. However, if standards are still not being attained after the implementation of Phases 1 and 2, further work and reductions will be warranted. Table 1 documents the TMDL equation for each of the impaired segments.

Table 1 - Summarizes the Specific Elements of the TMDLs.

Segment	Parameter	TMDL (cfu/yr)	WLA (cfu/yr)	LA (cfu/yr)	MOS
Carter Run	E-coli	1.22E+14	1.12E+12	1.21E+14	Implicit
Great Run	E-coli	2.83E+13	4.35E+12	2.40E+13	Implicit

The United States Fish and Wildlife Service has been provided with copy of these TMDLs.

III. Discussion of Regulatory Conditions

EPA finds that Virginia has provided sufficient information to meet all of the eight basic requirements for establishing primary contact (bacteriological) impairment TMDLs for Carter and Great Run. EPA is therefore approving these TMDLs. EPA=s approval is outlined according to the regulatory requirements listed below.

1) The TMDLs are designed to meet the applicable water quality standards.

Virginia has indicated that excessive levels of bacteria from both anthropogenic and natural sources have caused violations of the water quality criteria and designated uses in the Carter and Great Run Watersheds. The water quality criterion for fecal coliform was a geometric mean 200 cfu/100ml or an instantaneous standard of no more than 1,000 cfu/100ml. Two or more samples over a 30 day period are required for the geometric mean standard. The Commonwealth has changed its bacteriological criteria as indicated above. The new e-coli criteria require a geometric mean of 126 cfu/100ml of water with no sample exceeding 235 cfu/100 ml. The new criteria is more stringent than the previous criteria and a greater violation is expected if the loadings remained constant.

The load-duration approach, described above was used by the Commonwealth for the development of the Carter and Great Run TMDLs. This approach uses the flow data from a USGS gage, in-stream water quality data, a regression equation, and BST data to quantify the bacteria loading and the sources responsible for that loading. The load-duration approach in this instance developed a flow record for the impaired reaches based on observed flow data from the Battle Run and Rappahannock River respectively for Carter and Great Run. For each flow along the load-duration curve the allowable load can be determined by multiplying the numeric criteria by the flow. The observed loads were determined by multiplying the observed concentrations by the simulated flow at that time. In order to insure that the TMDLs were protective of all flow conditions, they were developed for the flow that exhibited the greatest difference between the observed and allowable loadings.

Through the use of BST, VADEQ was able to break down the sources of bacteria into four categories. The four categories of bacteria sources were human, pets, livestock, and wildlife. Three of these four sources are anthropogenic in origin and can be controlled via a variety of techniques. Wildlife, which may be attracted to certain areas due to anthropogenic reasons is considered a natural source of bacteria. VADEQ collected one year of BST samples from each of the waters. VADEQ determined the bacterial concentration and the percent loading derived from each source for each sample. The percent loading for each source category was averaged over the annual period. This average percent loading was used to determine the loading for each source.

2) The TMDLs include a total allowable load as well as individual waste load allocations and load allocations.

Total Allowable Loads

Virginia indicates that the total allowable loading is the sum of the loads allocated to land based precipitation driven nonpoint source areas (forest and agricultural land segments) and point sources. Activities that increase the levels of bacteria to the land surface or their availability to runoff are considered flux sources. The actual values for total loadings can be found in Table 1 of this document. The total allowable loads were calculated on an annual basis.

Waste Load Allocations

There are two point sources discharging to Carter Run and one point source discharging to Great Run. A single family unit is permitted to discharge 1,000 gallons of effluent per day with a bacteria concentration of 126 cfu/100ml to Carter Run. The Marshall Waste Water Treatment Plant is the other facility in the Carter Run Watershed and is permitted to discharge 640,000 gallons of effluent per day with an e-coli concentration of 126 cfu/100 ml. The Warrenton Sewage Treatment Plant discharges to the Great Run Watershed. This facility is permitted to discharge 2.5 million gallons of effluent per day with a e-coli concentration of 126 cfu/100 ml. The WLA for these facilities can be determined by multiplying the permitted flow by the permitted bacteria concentration by 365 days after the appropriate unit conversions. Table 2 documents the WLAs in the TMDLs. The point sources were not required to reduce their WLA because they are discharging at the water quality criteria.

EPA regulations require that an approvable TMDL include individual WLAs for each point source. According to 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(vii)(B), AEffluent limits developed to protect a narrative water quality criterion, a numeric water quality criterion, or both, are consistent with assumptions and requirements of any available WLA for the discharge prepared by the state and approved by EPA pursuant to 40 CFR 130.7.@ Furthermore, EPA has authority to object to the issuance of any National Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit that is inconsistent with the WLAs established for that point source.

Table 2 - Bacteriological (E-Coli) WLAs for Carter and Great Run

Stream	Facility Name	Permit Number	Allocated Load (cfu/yr)
Carter Run	Single Family Residence	VAG406058	1.74E+09
Carter Run	Marshall Waster Water Treatment Plant	VA0031763	1.11E+12
Great Run	Warrenton Sewage Treatment Plant	VA0021172	1.74E+09

Load Allocations

According to Federal regulations at 40 CFR 130.2(g), LAs are best estimates of the loading, which may range from reasonably accurate estimates to gross allotments, depending on the availability of data and appropriate techniques for predicting loading. Wherever possible, natural and nonpoint source loads should be distinguished. The load-duration approach used BST data to determine the bacteria load from each source. In order to meet a violation rate of around 10 percent, a 65 percent total load reduction is required in Carter Run and an 83 percent total load reduction is required in Great Run. In order for the criteria to not be violated, a 94 percent reduction in total loading is required in each watershed. Table 3 identifies the LAs for the impaired waters.

Table 3 - LA for Bacteria (E-Coli) for Carter and Great Run

Source Category	Carter Run		Great Run	
	Existing (cfu/yr)	Allocated (cfu/yr)	Existing (cfu/yr)	Allocated (cfu/yr)
Livestock	6.37E+14	3.89E+13	1.48E+14	7.78E+12
Pets	4.09E+14	2.50E+13	1.36E+14	7.14E+12
Human	8.09E+13	4.93E+12	2.02E+13	1.06E+12
Wildlife	8.53E+14	5.21E+13	1.52E+14	8.02E+12

3) The TMDLs consider the impacts of background pollution.

The TMDLs consider the impact of background pollutants by considering the bacterial load from natural sources such as wildlife.

4) The TMDLs consider critical environmental conditions.

According to EPA=s regulation 40 CFR 130.7 (c)(1), TMDLs are required to take into account critical conditions for stream flow, loading, and water quality parameters. The intent of this requirement is to ensure that the water quality of the impaired creeks is protected during times when it is most vulnerable.

Critical conditions are important because they describe the factors that combine to cause a violation of water quality standards and will help in identifying the actions that may have to be undertaken to meet water quality standards[2]. Critical conditions are a combination of environmental

[2]EPA memorandum regarding EPA Actions to Support High Quality TMDLs from Robert H. Wayland III, Director, Office of Wetlands, Oceans, and Watersheds to the Regional Management

factors (e.g., flow, temperature, etc.), which have an acceptably low frequency of occurrence. In specifying critical conditions in the waterbody, an attempt is made to use a reasonable Aworst-case@ scenario condition. This was addressed in the Carter and Great Run TMDLs by modeling the reductions to the flow that exhibited the greatest disparity between observed and allowable concentrations.

5) The TMDLs consider seasonal environmental variations.

Seasonal variations involve changes in stream flow and loadings as a result of hydrologic and climatological patterns. The loadings to Carter and Great Run were investigated on a monthly basis to determine if seasonality existed between the sources. Based on the BST results it was determined that there were minimal seasonal impacts to loading and the source loads were averaged on an annual basis.

6) The TMDLs include a margin of safety.

This requirement is intended to add a level of safety to the modeling process to account for any uncertainty. The MOS may be implicit, built into the modeling process by using conservative modeling assumptions, or explicit, taken as a percentage of the WLA, LA, or TMDL. Virginia included an implicit MOS in the TMDLs through the use of conservative modeling assumptions. Carter and Great Run were modeled to the single-most extreme water quality violation event and applied the percent reduction necessary during that event to all conditions.

7) There is a reasonable assurance that the TMDLs can be met.

EPA requires that there be a reasonable assurance that a TMDL can be implemented. WLAs will be implemented through the NPDES permit process. According to 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(vii)(B), the effluent limitations for an NPDES permit must be consistent with the assumptions and requirements of any available WLA for the discharge prepared by the state and approved by EPA. Furthermore, EPA has authority to object to issuance of an NPDES permit that is inconsistent with WLAs established for that point source.

Nonpoint source controls to achieve LAs can be implemented through a number of existing programs such as Section 319 of the CWA, commonly referred to as the Nonpoint Source Program.

8) The TMDLs have been subject to public participation.

The TMDLs for Carter and Great were subject to the Commonwealth=s public participation

---

Division Directors, August 9, 1999.

process. The meetings and comment periods for these TMDLs were public noticed in the Virginia Register. The first public meeting for the TMDLs was held on January 28, 2004 in Marshall, Virginia, five people attended. The second public meeting for the TMDLs was held in Warrenton, Virginia on November 16, 2004. No written comments were received.